

The Philanthropist

PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

GAMALIEL BAILEY, Jr., Editor.

We are verily galled concerning our brother therefore is this distress come upon us.

SAMUEL A. ALLEY, Printer.

VOLUME I. NO. 2. NEW SERIES.

CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1838.

WHOLE NO. 108.

THE PHILANTHROPIST,

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
N. W. corner of Main & Sixth streets,
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

JULIUS O. BEARDSLEE, Publishing Agent.
TERMS.—Two Dollars and fifty cents in advance. Let-
ters on business should be directed to the Publishing Agent,
those relating to the editorial department, to the Editor.
in all cases post paid.

POETRY.

From the Emancipator.

"The Southern states are destined to no common fate in
the history of nations. They will be amongst the greatest
and freest, or the most oppressed of nations. History presents
no such combination for republican liberty, as that which ex-
ists among them. The African for the laborer, the Anglo-
Saxon for the master and ruler. Both races will be exalted
and benefited by the relation. We dare not be passive with
the responsibilities which our situation involves. We must,
—we will awake,—if not to glory, to infamy; if not for de-
fence, for destruction most miserable; if not to triumph,—
to fall, to die, with the epithet upon our graves, (if graves we
are allowed,) written by the pen of philanthropy: 'Here lie
the meanest oppressors and cowards who ever polluted the
earth with their blood.'—Hon. Robert Barnwell Rhett's
Address, to his Constituents, dated Jan. 15, 1838.

As, ay, awake to infamy thou wilt
Thy infamy is not a thing to be;
The stains of thy long unrepented guilt
Cling to the present and the past,
And, while thy haughtiness shall last,
Thou shalt, as now, be steeped in infamy!

Thy shame abideth on thee, boasting South,—
Call not thy land republican nor free,—
'Incendiary' words ill suit thy mouth—
And till thy laborers are paid,
'A tyrant's partnership in trade'
Is fitter title for thy liberty.

Well hast thou tried thy race-exalting plan,
And well we see the benefits sublime
Of chains and stripes, and merchandise of man—
Slaves, by their brute-ward exaltation,
Raise fiend-ward by a due relation
Thy lords—to reach their goals in equal time.

Dame History don't tell us, true enough,
Of nations elevated by the whip,
For her republics lacked the proper stuff—
With bladders, pallid 'Anglo-Saxon'
The darker folk to bear his packs on,
And hide the biddings of his upturned lip.

You've hit the error of the ancient sages,
Which sent republics to such early graves,
Their laws forgot to take the laborer's wages
To fatten sinuous providers,
To whom, as asses to their riders,
The rest abode in, in sweet relation, slaves.

Here is the true republican foundation,
The spot that all the wise ever must land on,
The glorious principle of "combination"—
For what but useless appetites,
Are without, equal, human rights,
Without an equal of prostrate men to stand on!

Mock on beneath thy democratic cloak,
Thy tyrants tricks are seen and scorned the more;
The spell of thy hypocrisy is broke—
Ten thousand searching eyes are laid
Upon the secrets of thy trade—
Thy fly fingers sipping from the pool!

And sooth it is, thou must undo thy wrong,
Exchange thy whips and stocks for honest pay,
Or else the wolf shall howl and feed her young
Upon thy Anglo-Saxon fowl—
Receptacles of meanest knaves
That ever shunned the blessed light of day!

COMMUNICATIONS.

Letter of Samuel Ross to the Rev. Mr. Jenks.

Rev. and Dear Sir,
It is with diffidence that, I an obscure youth, at-
tempt to address a person in your station; yet a
retrospect of what passed the last time I saw you
has led me to believe it my duty to look into the
subject, and also to ask some little explanation.
But first let me assure you, that I wish to entertain
no unkind feelings, but to love and respect you as
formerly.

I believe that when, you called me out began to
converse in friendship, but, finding that I could not
be induced to recant and renounce those principles
which, with much investigation, I have adopted,
you began to deal with me in a harsh, unkind, un-
just and unchristian manner. First, by taking up
an ill report which you received, as I suppose, ei-
ther directly or indirectly, from a man known as an
avowed enemy of almost every christian enterprise.
Secondly, by accusing me in a public manner,
bringing charges which were not, neither can be
sustained, although some probably believed them
from mere report.

Thirdly, by assuming the sole right of speaking,
and by interrupting me whenever I attempted to
speak in defence of my principles or character.
Fourthly, by attempting to answer by ridicule,
rather than ingenious reason, those few arguments
which you allowed me to offer. As I supposed
that any good cause could be supported by fair
means, I became the more convinced that your
cause was unjust, by the means which you em-
ployed to support it. I shall now attempt a review
of the reasons you offered, why I should not med-
dle with the subject of Abolition.

First, you say, "It is causing great excitement
and agitation in the church and community, caus-
ing division, party spirit, &c." Let me ask you,
if this is a sufficient reason for abandoning one ob-
ject, may it not be for abandoning any, or every
object? What important enterprise was ever car-
ried on, that did not produce excitement, just in pro-
portion to the importance of the object to be ac-
complished? Did not the course pursued by Moses
and Aaron, produce excitement, and even cause the
task-masters to increase the burdens laid on the
Israelites? Yet what was the course advised by
the all-wise God? Was it that that proposed by South-
ern slave-holders and their abettors here in the
North? No. The Lord said, "I have surely seen
the affliction of my people, and am come down to
deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians."
The deliverance of the Israelites from captivity in
Babylon caused excitement, yet the work was great,
and justice and mercy required it, and the gates of
hell could not prevail against it. The Reformation
under Luther caused excitement, and the same ob-
jections were raised by anti-reformers, which are
now raised by anti-abolitionists; yet, thousands

have praised God, and will praise him through eter-
nity for the success of the Reformation; and I
believe that thousands will yet praise Him, for
the success of abolition, if it succeeds accord-
ing to its present prospect. The Temperance
cause, and also every revival of religion causes
excitement. In short, I say without fear of con-
tradiction, that no good cause is carried on with-
out it. This must naturally be the case, while hu-
man nature remains the same. But strange as it
may seem, in this enlightened age, this is brought
as an objection to a good cause, by those who
profess to know something of depraved human na-
ture—as if it were a perfect standard, and all con-
trary to it must be condemned, not remembering
that, "That which is highly esteemed among men,
is an abomination in the sight of God." I think
one moment's reflection is sufficient to lead any
candid man to acknowledge that, so far from being
an argument against the anti-slavery cause, the per-
secution and violent opposition which it meets, are
strong proofs of its righteousness. "Those that
will live Godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer perse-
cution." "If ye were of the world, the world
love his own," &c.

You remarked that, "it might do to agitate this
subject among some people, as New Englanders,
but not here where so many are emigrants from
Virginia, and have relatives who are interested in
the system of slavery." This argues that we must
wait till a subject becomes popular before we at-
tempt to advocate it. Suppose the most enlight-
ened persons in the community were all to adopt
this prudence, what advantage would the commu-
nity derive from them. It appears evident that,
"those who have distinguished themselves as ben-
efactors of mankind, by acting nobly and thinking
profoundly, have been noted for despising popular
prejudices, and departing from the common ways
of the world." When religion and morality are
concerned, to stand firm by what is fair and just,
resisting the torrent of corrupt public sentiment, is
the only course we can pursue, if we would not be
guilty of conniving at, or being partakers in the
sins of the nation. It is also evident, that he
who makes first great principles the basis of ac-
tion, will eventually acquire a greater influence
than he who seeks popular applause, and watching
the gale of public opinion, turns like the weather-
cock, to accommodate himself to it. If this ob-
jection proves that we should not meddle with the
subject of slavery and abolition, it may also excuse
us from speaking against any, or every sin. And
when God tells you, "to cry aloud, spare not, and
show his people their transgression, and the house
of Jacob their sins; when he says, 'I have set thee
a watchman to the house of Israel, to hear the
word at my mouth, and warn them from me; when
I say to the wicked thou shalt surely die, if thou
dost not warn the wicked from his way, he shall
die in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at
thy hand,' according to your reasoning in the
present case, you can excuse yourself by saying,
'I fear excitement and division, and think it is not
safe to obey.' What would you think of a min-
ister of the gospel, who should say, 'I dare not
preach against drunkenness and advocate temper-
ance, for some of my congregation are emigrants
from a region where intemperance prevails, and
have relatives who are engaged in the traffic and
use of alcohol?'"

But how does this argument tally with your in-
terrogation, "Why don't you go South?" What
need, I ask, of going to the 'South,' if people here
are so much interested in the system, that to op-
pose it, is to cause excitement? Let them be
convinced of the sin of slavery, and their influence
will be great in turning the minds of their friends
at the 'South.' From your own argument, I should
infer that this is the very place in which to ad-
vocate anti-slavery principles, and that we can as ef-
fectually plead the cause of the oppressed while
here, as we could at the 'South.' But is it so, that
we at the North have nothing to do with slavery,
while there are in the District of Columbia,
and in the Territories, (where "Congress has the
exclusive right of legislation," nearly 30,000
slaves? "Congress will not abolish slavery, till
the people call for it, and people will not call for it
till they feel it to be wrong, and they will not feel
it to be wrong till they examine it. Hence the
propriety and necessity of discussion."

Secondly, you say, "The remedy proposed
would be worse than the evils of slavery."
The enemies of almost every reform are wont to
urge this objection. But we are able to see, that
in the present case, experience has put the ques-
tion beyond a doubt; and even in reference to tem-
poral evils, those connected with slavery are al-
most infinitely greater than those which have fol-
lowed emancipation. But, what shall we say,
when we take into the account the eternal retribu-
tion—"When all shall receive according to the
deeds done in the body," and, "He shall have
judgment without mercy, that showed no mercy."
You chose to make what you called a practical
illustration of this point; viz. Lorenzo had built
a mill-dam, which overflowed his neighbor's farms.
They prosecuted him, and made him pay damages.
He was ordered to remove it forthwith, and was
exposed to new judgments daily while he neglected
it. He removed it, and the water overflowed
some farms below. He again was prosecuted, and
made to pay damages.

This parable seems to refer only to temporal ca-
lamities, and therefore must be imperfect. But,
which was the safer course, to retain the dam,
and thus expose himself to judgments continually,
or remove it and expose himself to one judgment?
Abolitionists would choose the latter. It appears
the man referred to, only acted when compelled
by his own interest. He was not moved by prin-
ciples of justice or mercy to his fellow-men, there-
fore he had no claim to mercy, or even to justice.
Which was the greater injustice, to deprive his
neighbors above, of the use of their farms entirely,
or subject those below to the inconvenience of hav-
ing their washed by a small inundation? You
can apply this to the case in hand. This objection
has been used by many of the apologists for sla-
very and as often answered by abolitionists. I was
surprised to hear your raise it, calling it an "in-
superable objection!" I had supposed, that you
would view the subject in a different light, remem-
bering that we are in the hand of that God, who
says, "Be ye merciful, as your Father in heaven
is merciful." "Blessed are the merciful for they
shall obtain mercy;" and "in keeping his com-
mandments, there is great reward."

Imaginary consequences are a new standard of
duty, yet strange as it may seem, this standard
finds advocates among christian ministers of the
nineteenth century. If the Word of God were
taken as the only rule of faith and practice, this
objection would never have been raised. This
Sacred Chart represents it as our duty to do justly,
love mercy, and walk humbly before God. It

says, "When a man's ways please the Lord, he
maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."
To say that immediate emancipation is not safe,
is to say that it is not safe for human beings to obey
their Creator; for if all should obey Him, the sys-
tem of slavery would have no supporters.

Facts, reason and experiment have abundantly
corroborated these statements. Look at the happy
results which followed the immediate emancipation
of 600,000 slaves by the French, and 800,000 by
the English, which in two islands was immediate.
The testimony of twenty missionaries convened at
the mission-house in Antigua, who all bore witness
to the good results of manumission, is as follows:
"The Sabbath is better observed, the conjugal and
social duties more respected, and education is ra-
pidly spreading. Unconditional freedom is work-
ing much better than the Apprenticeship System."
They say that "opportunities for doing good
are much greater, than they were under the reign
of slavery. No one can now compel the poor negro
to go out into the corn-field, or sugar-house, on the
Sabbath, instead of attending Divine worship."
The great necessity of continuing slavery is this,
"The slave is poor, ignorant, degraded and unfit
for liberty," therefore he must remain in the dark-
ness of slavery, deprived of light, liberty, and all
that is dear to him on earth, until he prepare him-
self for liberty! This is the wisdom of the pro-
slavery party. But what says the word of God
on this subject? "Rob not the poor, because he is
poor, neither oppress the afflicted in the gate, for
the Lord will plead their cause, and spoil the soul
of those that spoil them." "He that oppresseth the
poor reproacheth his Maker."

Thirdly, you remarked that "slavery or aboli-
tion is a political question, with which we have
nothing to do." This is an easy mode of getting rid
of duty. A minister who acknowledges that sla-
very is a sin, a great sin, an evil, the greatest evil
in the United States, can excuse himself by say-
ing, "It is a political question." What kind of sin
is it? Is it a political sin? A kind that God does
not allow and does not require his servants to re-
prove, when he tells them to declare his whole
counsel, "whether men will hear or whether they
will forbear?" The Temperance question has
been called "a political thing!" When every re-
formation becomes "political," ministers of the
gospel will have but little to do.

"Slavery takes away the key of knowledge,"
and withholds the word of God, which every man
is commanded to teach to his children, and is this
wholly a political question? Are there no great mo-
ral principles involved in it? Is there nothing to
excite the sympathy and prayers of christians, and
christian ministers, when they reflect that there are
hundreds of thousands of pagans in our highly fi-
re-worshipping land, who are legally debared from reading
the Bible, and even from the knowledge of letters?
And must we connive at such a cruel, bloody, south-
ernizing system, because it is a delicate subject?
When will it be less so? What if Martin Luther
had sought to evade his duty by such a subterfuge?
He went forward, and did not shrink from his duty
and his responsibility, and we are blessed with his
example.

If you call this a political question, I wish to
understand what you mean by saying that if I go
on as I have done, the church will lay hand on
me. Is the church about to take cognizance of
my political principles? If not, I do not see the
force of your argument.

Fourthly, you objected to abolition by saying,
"It is contrary to the laws of the land." If this
be so, why do not the opposers put the laws in
force? Why do anti-abolitionists find it necessary
first to trample under foot both the law of God and
laws of men, when they attempt to oppose aboli-
tionists? But, suppose it were contrary to the
law of the land to pray to the God of heaven; yet a
certain man, named Daniel, dared to disobey. The
Lord protected him, and shut the mouth of lions.
"If God be for us, who can be against us?" You
spoke of the doctrine of the apostles—"That we
ought to be subject to the powers that be." You
probably forgot to mention their example, when
the "powers that be" contravened the powers that
were from above. In such cases they did not hesi-
tate even when "when straitly charged by the magis-
trates." Whether it be right in the sight of God
to hearken to you more than unto God, judge ye,
is their answer, by inspiration given. Your ar-
gument is opposed to the real design of Scripture,
and would leave man to make such laws as he
pleases, while the Scriptures can do nothing but
tell him to "be subject to the powers that be."

Fifthly—You argued, that "the Scriptures seem
to approve and not condemn slavery."
Here let me notice that you acknowledged sla-
very to be a sin, a great sin, an evil,—the great-
est evil in the United States. Now, do the
Scriptures approve of "great sins?" How do you
know sin but by the law of God? How can sla-
very be sinful unless it be contrary to the law of
God? "For sin is a transgression of the law of God."
Why, then, bring this same broken law to ad-
vocate that which you call sin? I should like to
quote from an address of the Presbyterian synod
of slave-holding Kentucky, as they are not car-
ried away with the "Fanaticism of abolition" so
far as I am. But I have been too prolix, and must
be brief. The writers of this address, though
living in the midst of slavery, manifest no inclina-
tion to crouch to public opinion, or court popular
applause.

The Greek language has no word that exactly
corresponds with our term slave; consequently
this word occurs but once in the New Testament,
and that is in speaking of the destruction of Baby-
lon, which had made "herself rich by her mer-
chandise in wine, oil, wheat, beasts, and slaves
and souls of men." How could we expect to
find the words in Scripture, "slavery is sinful,"
when the language in which it was written has no
word of the signification of our term of slave?
—The question has been asked, Why do not the
Scriptures prohibit the use, as a beverage, of ar-
dent spirits, and direct us to form temperance so-
cieties, if they should be formed? This is similar
to your query, "Why did not Christ and his
apostles forbid slavery, and form anti-slavery so-
cieties? Why, I ask, did they not form Bible and
Tract Societies? &c." The same answer may
be given to all these queries—Christ left some-
thing for his followers to do.

(To be continued.)

Meeting of Sandy Spring A. S. Society,
Adams Co.

Mr. Editor.—In pursuance of a call from the
president, the Sandy Spring Anti-Slavery Society
met in the Presbyterian church, on Friday, the 9th
of February, 1838.

Rev. Ebenezer Buckingham opened the meet-
ing with prayer. An address was then delivered

by Joseph Chester to a large and attentive audience.
After which the following resolutions, prepared by
E. Buckingham, were presented to the meeting; and,
after some remarks by the mover, Dr. M. P. Baird
and Joseph Chester, were unanimously adopted.

Resolved, 1st,—That we, as Christians and pa-
triot, deplore the recent unlawful and shameful
transactions at Alton, Ill., by which a peaceful
city was thrown into confusion, sacred rights
trampled under foot, and a devotedly faithful min-
ister of the gospel deprived of life.

Resolved, 2d,—That the present aspect of things
in our country, the spirit of insubordination and
mobism, the disposition so extensively manifested
to destroy liberty of conscience, liberty of speech,
and liberty of the press, call for prompt and de-
cisive action in behalf of our civil and religious lib-
erties on the part of every patriot and Christian.

Resolved, 3d,—That we consider the resolu-
tion of Mr. Patton, passed in the House of Re-
presentatives of the United States, Dec. 21, 1837,
in which the right of petition is denied, to be a
palpable infringement of the constitutional and in-
alienable rights of every American citizen; and fur-
ther, we believe, that justice to the American pub-
lic demands the immediate rescinding of this op-
pressive and disgraceful resolution.

Resolved, 4th,—That the right to think, speak,
and write upon any and every subject, is guaran-
teed to every man by the very charter of his being;
and any efforts to deprive him of this sacred right,
are anti-republican and anti-Christian.

Resolved, 5th,—That no man, in the Bible
sense, is a true philanthropist, who does not unite
fervent prayer to Almighty God, with wise and
prudent efforts, for the benefits of his race.

The following resolution was then offered by
M. P. Baird, and after some remarks by the
mover and J. Chester, was adopted:

Resolved,—That we deeply deplore the prac-
tice of many abolitionists, of applying to their op-
ponents and slaveholders the character of thieves,
robbers, man-stealers, anti-Christian, anti-re-
publican, and other denunciatory epithets, as such
expressions tend in no wise to advance, but to re-
tard the great and good cause of anti-slavery.

Resolved,—That a copy of these resolutions,
and of the proceedings of this meeting, be sent to
the Philanthropist for publication.

On motion adjourned.
ROBERT BAIRD, Pres't.
ZENAS HAYWARD, Rec. Sec.
Feb. 15, 1838.

New Richmond.

Clermont Co., Feb. 3, 1838.
MR. BAILEY.—At a regular monthly meeting of
the New Richmond Anti-Slavery Society, held on
the evening of the 3d February, 1838, the follow-
ing resolutions were read and unanimously adopt-
ed:—

Resolved,—That as abolitionists we deprecate
the use of deadly weapons to sustain the anti-sla-
very cause, and rely upon none but such as will
meet the approbation of the Prince of Peace.

Resolved,—That we highly appreciate the labors
of our sister Angelina E. Grimké in the cause of
the suffering slave, and hereby in the spirit of sym-
pathy and encouragement, tender to her our con-
gratulations, and bid her God's speed in the cause
of righteousness and peace.

Resolved,—That the above resolutions be for-
warded to the editor of the Philanthropist for pub-
lication.

JAMES BLAKESLEE, Pres't.
JAMES H. PARKER, Sec.

Resolutions.

Adopted by the Antrim Anti-Slavery Society, at
a special meeting, Jan. 16th, 1838.

1. Resolved, That American Slavery in the ab-
stract, and in the concrete, in principle and in prac-
tice, in all circumstances and under all pretensions,
is a—most impudent, malignant and iniquitous
invasion of the prerogatives of God, and thus rights
of man, and equally at war with the Declaration of
Independence, and our christian institutions.

2. Resolved, That the spirit of mobocracy,
which has spread itself over the length and breadth
of our beloved country like an evil genius, calls
loudly on all orderly and good citizens to relinquish
party attachments, and to act with a view to the
supremacy of the laws, the inviolability of consti-
tutional privileges and the equal rights of all.

3. Resolved, That we view the course pursued
by a majority of Congress in refusing to hear our
petitions, as a virtual denial of the right of peti-
tion, a right solemnly guaranteed to us by the Consti-
tution of the United States.

4. Resolved, That we tender our thanks to every
member of Congress, who voted against the late
gag-resolution adopted by that body, and we would
mention with respect the names of J. Q. Adams,
Slade and Swift, of Vermont, and Morris of Ohio.

5. Resolved, That the citizens and civil author-
ities of Alton in winking at the deeds of blood
and carnage perpetrated by her civil authority have
justified their hitherto far-famed city a double
portion of hard-earned infamy and public disgrace,
which can only be washed off by their deepest
contrition and practical evidence of their determi-
nation to uphold and support the supremacy of the
laws for the time to come.

6. Resolved, That the sentiment expressed in
the latter clause of a resolution adopted by the
Colonization Society of Antrim, Ohio, on the 1st
of Jan. 1838, (making the martyred Lovejoy access-
ary to his own death,) has given demonstrative evi-
dence of the paralyzing influence of the principles
and measures of the American Colonization So-
ciety over the minds of those who enlist them-
selves under her banner.

JOHN CARY, Pres't.

ALEX. PATTERSON, Sec'y.

The resolution alluded to above, passed by the
Colonization Society, is as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Society,
moral reform should not be propagated by coercive
measures, and therefore, although we cannot but
regret the death of the Rev. E. P. Lovejoy, yet we
attribute much of the blame to the course adopt-
ed by him, as being inconsistent with the mild and
persuasive means adopted by the Apostles in the
dissemination of the doctrines of christianity.

New York Observer.—Rev. Hubbard Winslow
and Rev. E. P. Lovejoy.

Mr. Bailey.—Six copies of the "Observer"
were taken by the students of Lane Seminary last
year. Two students are subscribers this year, one
of whom retains it chiefly on account of its inter-
esting correspondence. If any readers of the Phil-
anthropist take that paper, it may be well they
should be reminded that Mr. Tracy, formerly of

the "Vermont Chronicle," (now under the care of
his brother,) and late of the "Boston Recorder,"
is in the editorial of the "Observer" now.

This notice may be necessary to enable your
readers to know the author of some remarkable
pieces in the editorial of the "Observer," as Mr.
Tracy's name does not appear on the paper, as
editor. The pieces respect affairs at Alton. The
"Observer" does not say Mr. Lovejoy or his
friends were guilty of the crime of exciting a riot.
He does not say that Rev. Hubbard Winslow's
definition of Republican Liberty—"the liberty to
say and do what the prevailing voice and will of
the brotherhood will allow and protect"—is a true
definition of republican freedom. But he does say,
in this connexion, and as bearing on the Lovejoy
case, "that it is not safe to abstain from blaming
the seducer, lest we be accused of apologising for
the seduced;" and he argues the whole case from
analogies in which the sufferers by the Alton mob,
are represented by grog-sellers who tempt men to
drunkenness—though the Observer does not affirm
that Lovejoy or his friends were the instigators of
riot and murder.

When the "Observer" says, "nor can we wil-
lingly inflame the public, or any part of the pub-
lic, with rage, any more than with lust, or wine,
and be innocent;" after informing us that he does
not mean to "answer the question directly," whether
Lovejoy did right or wrong in staying and dying
as he did; what does he mean his readers
shall understand? The facts were all before him
in the Alton case, why does he not, like a man, (if
not like a minister,) tell us plainly what he does
hold respecting Lovejoy? If he believe him and
his friends guilty of instigation of riot and murder,
why does he not say so in terms? It were a thou-
sand times more honorable, though, it must be con-
fessed, proportionally less in keeping. Another
sentiment is, "It is a duty to avoid the perform-
ance of all acts, which, though in themselves law-
ful, will probably excite unwholesome passions in
others." I do not mean to review his piece, which,
like almost every production from the same pen,
especially on the subject of slavery, is as remark-
able for its perverse acuteness as for its malicious
bearing; but simply state that from personal knowl-
edge, I know that the "consequences" of Mr.
Tracy's editorial toils have been signally unfortu-
nate in exciting other than "holy" feeling hereto-
fore. It is not in my knowledge that there ever
was such a thing as a ministerial quarrel in Ver-
mont prior to the establishment of the Chronicle
there; but it is in my knowledge that the Chroni-
cle, always under his and his brother's care, was
the unfortunate vehicle of a painful strife got up
somehow. And having been his subscriber at dif-
ferent times myself, the public will know if I err,
when I state, as my judgment, have been more re-
markable for biting satire, subtle contention, than
for candor or charity. I trust no abolitionist will
take the paper.

"SINCERITY."

A Few Queries.

Mr. Editor.—As Mr. Campbell has always
shown a readiness to instruct the ignorant, and has
professed a laudable zeal against modern errors,
perhaps, as a servant of Jesus Christ, he may
kindly resolve a few scruples of one who also pro-
fesses to serve the same master.

If, as he says in his letter in the Philanthro-
pist, September 29th, 1837, "American sla-
very is contrary to the philanthropy of the christian
institution, root and branch, and contrary to the
eternal and immutable principles of gospel
righteousness and gospel benevolence; and if there
is reason to fear that the vials of the fiercest in-
dignation of God, from the angels of destruction,
shall be poured out upon our nation if it do not
repent and reform, and put away this manifold
evil from among us;" is it agreeable to the Word
and will of God, that individuals, and even whole
families living in the full practice of this system,
should be baptized into the name of the Father,
into the name of the Son, and into the name of the
Holy Spirit, and then take the name of "reformed
churches of Jesus Christ?" See Luke iii. 8. 1
John iii. 8.

Is forming such churches not making the "house
of God a den of thieves?" Matt. xxi. 13.

Is forming and countenancing such societies not
solemn trifling with eternal things. And is not
their worship an abomination in the sight of God?
Isa. i. 13—17. Gal. vi. 7.

Are preachers, addressing such as children of
God, not prophesying lies in the name of the
Lord? Zech. xiii. 3. Jer. vi. 14.

Is God in Christ honored or dishonored by such
assemblies? Rom. ii. 23.

If the church of the living God is the pillar and
ground of the truth, holding up the truth and right-
eousness to the surrounding world, what do such
societies exhibit? Jer. xxiii. 15. Luke xi. 35.

If the wrath of God is revealed from heaven
against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men,
who hold the truth in unrighteousness, Rom. i. 18,
ought not such societies to expect the divine ven-
geance? Mal. iii. 5.

Are not preachers, who are instrumental in form-
ing such societies, deceiving perishing souls to
their eternal ruin? Jer. xxiii. 16, 17.

Are not teachers, administering the Lord's sup-
per to such, encouraging people to eat and drink
damnation to themselves? 1 Cor. xi. 29. 1 Cor.
v. 8.

Will such a religion be of any use in another
world? Matt. vii. 21, 22, 23.

Are the cruelties of the inquisition actions more
sinful in the sight of God, than the cruelties in-
flicted upon colored people by pretended christian
protestant sects in this country at this time? Col.
iii. 25.

Do not the reformed Baptists, in one part of
their conference, agree with the Mother of Harlots,
that a part appears to some of us highly criminal—
Slaves and souls of men? Rev. 18, 13.

ELEUTHERIA.

Delaware Co. Anti-Slavery Society.

Brown Del. co., Nov. 13, 1837.

The Delaware County Anti-Slavery Society met
this morning, at 10 o'clock, A.M., at the Baptist
meeting-house; which was opened by prayer by
the Rev. J. Eaton, after which was offered, by
Mr. Jameson, the following resolution:—

Resolved,—That the individual members of this
society, at the opening and closing of each meet-
ing, occupy a short time in secretly offering to the
Great Supreme, their aspirations, invoking bless-
ings on the abolition enterprise, and rendering
thanksgiving for the progress of public opinion
and truth.

The following resolution was offered by Samuel
Ross:

Resolved,—That the principles of republican-

ism, of justice, and of Christianity, call upon us
to seek the repeal of all those laws, which in this
state subject a portion of our fellow-men to legal
disabilities on the account of their color.

After making some remarks respecting

Kentucky.

There is a considerable degree of genuine spirit of liberty in this state, although the state two or three years since, published the views of the subject of slavery, and, in the present, it is a great evil, and that it ought to be abolished as soon as possible; and recommending immediate adoption of measures preparatory to its abolition. They were more in the nature of a general sentiment, than of any free state, and the legislature of Kentucky, three or four years since, made an attempt to abolish slavery, and in the popular branch came within one, if we rightly remember, of carrying the vote.

On the murder of Lovejoy, the Louisville (Ky.) papers denounced the outrage in the most strong and independent language, and expressed sentiments in favor of maintaining the liberty of the press, worthy of freemen. They have the present legislature of Kentucky have been making provision for calling a convention to alter the state constitution, the chief object of which, it is said, is to see whether the people will voluntarily give up the right of free speech, and the right of the people to be free from the oppression of the state, and to express their minds freely on the subject.—Greenfield Mercury.

The editor of one of the Charleston, S. C. papers says, "after the House of Representatives, at the instance of ON THE DICTATION OF THE SOUTH, had hermetically sealed the door against the intrusion of abolition, &c."—Comment is unnecessary.

MR. BIRNEY IN MAINE.—We have seen a letter from this gentleman, giving an interesting account of his visit to Hallowell and Augusta. His lecture was attended by the most distinguished citizens, and he was welcomed with great hospitality. We regret that we have not room for extracts.

The Herald of Freedom says.—Rev. S. J. May read a letter from John Quincy Adams which he had recently received from that venerable statesman, in which he urged the North to throw aside all minor differences and protest as with the voice of one man against the admission of Texas. He said the friends of this measure in both Houses of Congress are powerfully strong, and fearfully determined to accomplish this result, and that his only hope of the salvation of his country was in the indomitable spirit of liberty which now exists at the North, rising above all and arresting the diabolical scheme now seeking to sink our country into irretrievable ruin.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI:

Tuesday Morning, March 6, 1838.

Letter of Samuel Ross.

The writer of this letter (the publication of which is commenced on our first page), resides, we believe, in Brown, Delaware co. His moral character, so far as we can learn, is unimpeachable. In the annual circular of the Western Reserve College, of which he was formerly a student, and in a letter published in the Ohio Observer, 28th of June last, by one of his tutors, strong testimony is borne to his excellent habits and attainments. From a communication made to us by several members of the Anti-Slavery Society of Brown, accompanying the letter, we learn that Mr. Ross was a beneficiary of the Assembly's Board of Education, and was under the care of the Marion Presbytery. Mr. Jenks was a member of the committee of examination in this presbytery. "Mr. Ross presented a certificate to Mr. Jenks; he presented it to the elders, and in a few minutes he went and said to Mr. R., 'You are received into the church, sir.'"

On the next day he told Mr. Ross he wished to converse with him. It was concerning abolition. He wished him to say nothing on this subject, for there were men on both sides of the question; besides, he was a beneficiary, the assembly were divided on the subject, and a large share of their funds came from Southern members. Mr. Ross replied, that he considered slavery a great sin, and claimed the right of speaking against it. The conversation waxed warm, people assembled around them, and Mr. Jenks became more imperious.—He brought many severe accusations against the young gentleman—bade him hold his tongue—and threatened to use his influence against him at the presbytery. Mr. Ross, denied the privilege of speaking, determined to write the letter, a copy of which has been forwarded to us by his friends, requesting its publication.

The letter was sent to Mr. Jenks, who did not think proper to answer it. The result was, however, that he resolved to eject the writer from the church. Not being able to effect this by ordinary process, he directed the clerk to bring the certificate of Mr. Ross, that he might examine whether there might not be some flaw in it; and true enough, he detected the omission of two or three words, to which, however, none had thought of objecting when Mr. Ross was received. Mr. Jenks assembled the elders, induced them to believe that he had not been legally received,—and thereupon they voted to return him his certificate, and to consider him no longer a member of the church.

Subsequently, the presbytery, influenced by the representations of Mr. Jenks, in the absence of Mr. Ross, and when none was present to speak for him, "voted him out of the board of education."

Such is the representation of the case, as furnished by Isaac Eaton, D. Finlay, and O. Haugh, citizens of Brown township, who say that they have made these statements according to the best information they could procure. If it be correct, then it is clear that Mr. Ross has been expelled from Christian fellowship, for holding fast his integrity—for persisting in the advocacy of the cause of the suffering and dumb. He has been persecuted by professing Christians for conscience, sake.

We have given these particulars at the request of a meeting of citizens in Brown township, and also to illustrate the power of the pro-slavery spirit at the North.

Indiana Convention.

We hope our friends in Indiana will put forth vigorous exertions to make this movement effective. We shall keep the "call" standing in our paper. We would suggest that societies in that state assemble, and resolve to subscribe for so many copies of the Philanthropist, to be distributed by themselves, or sent by us according to their direction, to any individuals they may choose to designate throughout the state. In this way general information would be given of the contemplated convention, and a larger attendance be secured. All the free states eastwardly, with the exception of Connecticut and New Jersey, have their state societies, and Connecticut is not long to be an exception. All the other free states, with the exception of Indiana, have their state societies. How long—how long shall Indiana sleep on this great question! SEND IN YOUR NAMES.

Dunlevy's Report.

One or two numbers back, we said we should have liked Mr. Dunlevy's report better, if there had been an additional resolution, requesting the governor to make a demand for the kidnappers of Eliza J. Johnson. A member of the House at Columbus inform us, in explanation, that "this, in the opinion of the committee, was unnecessary; as, when an indictment is found under the constitution of the United States, the executive has that power, and it is then obligatory on the Governor of Kentucky to call them to demand."

We are further informed, that an indictment has been found, and the individuals have concluded to traverse it.

An Explanation.

We cheerfully following communication. It is our wish carefully to avoid doing wrong to any individual, but when persons place themselves in an ambiguous situation, without one word of explanation, they ought not to complain if their conduct should be mistaken.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Columbus, O., Feb. 23, 1838.

MR. EDITOR.—A friend has kindly favored me with a number of the "Philanthropist" of the 20th instant, in which I am represented, in an editorial article, headed "right of petition," as *mean enough, yes, mean enough, to trample on that humble right of rights, the right of the suffering and oppressed, to pray for their oppressors for relief.* Believing that you have done me injustice, by representing me as opposed to the right of petition, I respectfully request, as an act of justice, an early insertion of the following explanation of my motives, for voting against the motion to lay the petition referred to, on the table.

On the 8th instant, a petition, purporting to have been signed by several hundred colored persons, was presented by Mr. Foote, who, after the reading of the petition by the clerk, moved to lay it on the table, which was carried by a vote of 47 to 18, myself in the negative. I voted against the motion, because the whole affair had, to me, the appearance of an attempted fraud on the Legislature, the petition appearing to have been recently written, and contained under the name of no petitioner. The names were written on sundry small papers, which were attached to each other and to the petition with wafers, and were sufficiently dirty and worn, (many of which appeared to have been written by the same hand), to justify the belief of an attempted fraud. My vote was recorded in the negative, on the motion to lay on the table, which implied and was equal to a motion to receive, from the conviction that the petition did not come within the provisions of the act regulating the mode of petitioning the Legislature in certain cases, one of which provisions is, that "the names of petitioners shall not be written on a separate paper or sheet and attached to the petition."

The questions of the constitutional right of negroes to petition the Legislature, or of the propriety of receiving as a matter of favor their petitions, are questions which did not come up for consideration with me; my vote was given, without any reference to my views on these questions, but because of the strong probability of an attempt to play off a fraud on the Legislature.

Respectfully yours, I. SMUCKER.

As to the "attempted fraud" talked of, Mr. Codding's remarks in our last, furnish a very satisfactory explanation.—Ed. Phil.

ABDUCTION CASE.—We have only room to say, that the resolution and preamble reported by Mr. Dunlevy, in relation to this case, have been taken up and adopted. Particulars in our next.

We have some valuable communications on hand, that shall appear in our next.

A Death-bed Conscience.

We observe in the last Methodist Protestant a beautiful obituary notice of the death of Mrs. Hannah Dunlevy, wife of Dr. J. M. Dunlevy, an eminent physician in Baltimore. We once had the pleasure of an acquaintance with this lady, and all that is said in the notice referred to, of her distinguished worth as a rational Christian, we most heartily believe. We select the following extract to show the power of a death-bed conscience—the keenness of moral perception the soul acquires, when thoughts and feelings of a merely worldly sort are vanishing before the stupendous realities of eternity.

"During the last seven years of her life, Mrs. Jennings was afflicted with a disease of the heart, accompanied by incessant and most distressing palpitations. Several times in the interval she was supposed to be near death. On one of these occasions, the condition of certain slaves, in whom she held a life estate, and who were willed, at her death, to her children, bore heavily upon her mind. Deeming the opportunity favorable, she appealed to her sons in their behalf,—obtained a cheerful consent to their emancipation,—had the necessary documents immediately prepared, and then rejoiced, as was both natural and religious, in the accomplishment of the best of all good works, in a case where her own control was so slight, and the interest of others, in a worldly sense, so great."

This is not the first time that a death-bed has borne testimony to the truth of the doctrine of immediate emancipation. What a good thing were it, if all slaveholders would listen as attentively to the voice of conscience, while living as when dying!

The Cause in Illinois.

The Anti-Slavery Society of Putnam co., Ill., convened at Union Grove, Jan. 1st. James M. Diekey, and C. Cook, ministers of the gospel, were the speakers.

Several spirited resolutions were passed.—Thirty-nine members were added to the society, which now numbers 108.

Officers for the present year.—Sam. D. Laughlin, president; William Stewart, vice-president; John P. Blake, rec. sec.; William M. Stewart, cor. sec.; Dr. David Ritchey, treasurer.

Western Adventurer.

We perceive this paper is assuming a bold and an independent tone on the subject of abolitionism. We know not whether its editor be an abolitionist, but we do know that with such a number as our paper, no abolitionist can find fault. We are very sorry that its patronage is not enough to secure its weekly publication. It is now published semi-monthly. The abolitionists of Illinois should not suffer it to languish. The editor in his new prospectus speaks thus:—

Planted upon the broad ground of the rights of an American citizen, it will advocate the unshackled liberty of the press—universal religious toleration—liberty of conscience—and the right of free discussion on all subjects of human interest; and it will stand inviolably pledged to oppose whatever, in general, may be hostile to these principles. The title of American citizen is far more characteristic than was the once proud name of Roman citizen, in the days of Roman greatness and glory; and the grand object of the conductors of the Adventurer will be to preserve it in its original significance.

It is published at Illinois, Commerce and Wisconsin—Terms, \$2 per annum.

We had prepared a good deal of editorial matter for this number, but we cheerfully yield place to our valuable correspondent. We earnestly ask the attention of the members of the General Assembly to the following article. The author of it is one of the most distinguished lawyers in the State, and is not an abolitionist.

REVIEW

OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, IN THE SENATE OF OHIO, UPON THE TRIAL BY JURY OF PERSONS CLAIMED AS FUGITIVES FROM SERVICE.

The monstrous outrages upon personal liberty, perpetrated under the forms of the Act of Congress of 1793, concerning fugitives from service, have lately attracted a large share of public attention. Human sympathy is naturally and powerfully excited, when, in the midst of a free community, men are dragged before a petty magistrate, without any legal process, and, upon affidavits prepared for the occasion, certified to be slaves, and handed over with scarce an hour's delay, into actual slavery.

The first inquiry which such an occurrence suggests to a reflecting mind is, "Can it be that proceedings like these are sanctioned by law? Is it possible that in the nineteenth century, in republican America, human liberty is held so cheap, that an assault upon personal freedom, so violent, so nefarious, so dangerous, can be committed under the shield of legislative sanction?" And, when the astonished inquirer learns that the whole proceeding which has so shocked and alarmed him, has taken place in precise accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress—an act which authorizes any body and every body who may think fit to assert a claim to the services of an individual, alleged to have escaped from another state, to seize him and drag him before any magistrate whom he may judge fittest for his purpose, and establish his claim by affidavits or other proof, at his own convenience—which allows no opportunity of contesting the claim thus set up, no process to compel the attendance of witnesses, and no trial—which permits the magistrate to make terms as to compensation for his services with the claimant who seeks his aid—which obliges him to keep no record of his proceedings, nor even requires him to conduct the investigation, in public—which authorizes him, if satisfied of the validity of the claim set up to grant a certificate to that effect, and makes that certificate a valid warrant for the removal of the person claimed, whithersoever the claimant may choose to take him—and which, finally, is totally irrespective of condition, color, sex or age—he may well demand further, if such an act as this, which breaks down all the safeguards of natural right which the wisdom and experience of ages have provided, can be consistent with the constitution of a country calling itself free!

It is certain that the act of Congress is just such an act as has been described: and it is certain also that the wrongs daily perpetrated under its forms, justify the worst apprehensions which its anomalous provisions are calculated to inspire.

But lately, an individual was brought before a magistrate in Cincinnati, committed to jail for the night, and the next morning, before his counsel had been able to compile a bill for an injunction which he was preparing, certified to be a slave and hurried off to Kentucky. This person has been since adjudged to be a freeman by a Court in Mississippi! More recently, a boy was seized in the same city; carried before one magistrate, who was too busy to hear the proofs of claim; then before another who was also too busy, and finally before the Mayor, who happened to be at leisure, heard the proofs and granted the certificate. And with such despatch was all this accomplished, that though the boy's friends instantly employed a lawyer, and though the gentleman thus employed immediately followed the boy and his captors from magistrate to magistrate and then to the Mayor's office, he only arrived in time to witness the delivery of the certificate to the claimants of the boy—a tragical conclusion of a judicial farce!

These facts, and the hundreds of similar facts frequently occurring, cannot and should not pass unnoticed. All over the country public attention has been drawn to the subject. Judges and jurists of the highest reputation, have pronounced the act which sanctions these proceedings, unjust, oppressive, and unconstitutional. The rights of the citizens against it, by extending over all persons claimed as fugitives from justice the ample shield of the jury trial. And in the course of the last few months, thousands of the citizens of Ohio have petitioned their Legislature for similar protection. These petitions were referred in the Senate, to the Judiciary Committee, a majority of which have reported that it is inexpedient to grant the prayer of the petitioners! Yes, a majority of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of Ohio report that it is not expedient to extend the benefits of the jury trial to all persons in the State! Though the CONSTITUTION of Ohio declares that the right of trial by jury shall be preserved inviolate, a majority of this committee recommend that the right of trial by jury be not preserved inviolate! Let us be thankful that this report is the report of a majority only, and be comforted in the assurance that the intelligence and patriotism of the freemen of Ohio will soon correct the opinions of this majority, or fill their places in the halls of legislation with wiser men.

The Committee commence their report with the assertion, that the petitions on the subject of the jury trial are emanations from the spirit of negro emancipation which now agitates the country. Abolitionists ought to feel themselves complimented, by the uniform ascription of every effort in behalf of human rights to the spirit of abolitionism: but the majority of the Committee are certainly grievously in error if they intend to assert that abolitionists, as such, are more deeply interested in the object of these petitions, than thousands of their fellow-citizens. The writer of this is not an abolitionist, and yet he avows an interest in this object, inferior to no man's. The thirty clergymen of Cincinnati, who united in the late petition on the subject of trial by jury, were not abolitionists, and yet they were by no means indifferent to the fate of their petition. The majority of the committee may rest assured that nothing is to be gained by calling names. The doctrines of the report will need something more potent, than a side-wind from the fast-sinking prejudice against abolitionism, to waft them into the haven of popular sympathy and regard.

The majority of the Committee have fallen into another error not less important. They say that there are but two classes of persons from whom the right of trial by jury is withheld—fugitives from justice, and slaves sought to be reclaimed by their owners. The majority of the Committee ought to know, that the word "slaves" is not to be found in the Constitution of the United States or in the act of Congress, and that no provision is made for the reclamation of fugitive slaves as such. The act provides for the reclamation of persons held to service and escaping from the state in which they are so held into another state; and embraces not only slaves, but apprentices and servants by contract, without distinction of color. And the majority of the Committee ought also to know, that all persons claimed as escaping servants are not really such, and that all the instances in which persons not held to service or not escaping, are seized and delivered up under the act of Congress, constitute a very large class of cases, in which the right of trial by jury is withheld from FREE CITIZENS. The assertion may seem bold, and yet is undeniably true that the honorable chairman of the Judiciary Committee himself is liable, under the act of Congress, to be seized as a fugitive from service, and to be consigned by the certificate of a magistrate to actual servitude. Let any man procure affidavits taken before some magistrate, no matter whom that the honorable chairman is an escaping servant; let him then be taken before a magistrate and claimed under those affidavits, and what shall hinder the magistrate from certifying him into bondage? The honorable chairman may smile in conscious security, but what foundation does his certainty of safety rest? Is it upon a foundation broad enough and strong enough for all his fellow-citizens to rest upon likewise? Is it upon the immovable foundation of law? Not at all! His security depends upon his color, his character, his station, and upon nothing else. His less fortunate fellow-citizens, poor, unknown and friendless, and especially those "guilty of a skin not colored like his own" have no security—none whatever. Let it not be said then that "none but slaves escaping from their owners" need the safeguard of the jury trial.

It would be unjust, however, to the majority of the Committee, to permit it to be understood, that they defend their recommendation that the prayer of the petitioners be denied, on grounds of natural right or general expediency. The strong argument of the Committee is, that Congress has legislated on the subject; that Congress has constitutional power to legislate; and, therefore, the State cannot constitutionally legislate.

Let this argument be examined. It is not pretended that the Constitution confers on Congress any power to legislate in regard to escaping servants by express grant; but the Committee argue that "the power exists by necessary implication." The power of Congress then, if it exists at all, is an implied power. And here, before we proceed further, we may as well dispose of the argument based upon the history of the country. The majority of the Committee say that the circumstances, under which the Constitution was framed, warrant the inference that the framers of the Constitution intended to confer on Congress power to provide by law a summary mode of reclaiming fugitive slaves. The answer to this is easy. It is a simple negation. The circumstances under which the Constitution was framed warrant no such inference. The majority of the Committee say it MUST HAVE BEEN the intention of the framers of the Constitution to confer the power. TO THIS MUST HAVE BEEN, we oppose a simple CANNOT HAVE BEEN.

The Committee say, that "the principal difficulties" of the Convention, which framed the Constitution, "originated in the question of slavery." And this is said as if the question whether fugitives from service should be delivered up or not, was a question of difficulty and debate in the Convention. Nothing could be wider of the truth. The question of slavery did occasion great embarrassment, as it affected taxation and representation; and, also, when it was claimed that the slave trade, which the Congress of the Confederation had solemnly denounced, should be permitted to revive and continue until 1803. But the question, whether fugitives from service should be delivered up or not, never occasioned the slightest embarrassment. The provision in the constitution was taken from the ordinance of 1787, which had just been adopted by the Congress of the Confederation, and adopted by the convention unanimously. The precise mischief to be remedied was, that slaves escaping from a slave state into a free state, became free by the operation of the laws of the free states, and could not be reclaimed: the natural and obvious remedy for this mischief was a stipulation between the states, that slaves so escaping should not become free, but should be delivered up on claim. And this was the precise remedy provided: though the framers of the constitution, unwilling that that sacred instrument should be polluted by any formal recognition of slavery, preferred to employ the more comprehensive term of "persons held to service," rather than the word "slaves." This is the whole history of the country in reference to this matter. And what is there in it to warrant the inference that the convention designed to strip the states of all power to protect the personal liberty of their citizens in a most important class of cases, and to confer on Congress the power to establish tribunals, throughout the whole land, for the summary investigation of claims to service? Nothing, absolutely nothing. On the contrary, the whole history of the times is at war with such an inference. Every body, at all familiar with the events of that period, knows that universal emancipation was then a favorite idea with the leading characters in the country; that many states had made provision for the gradual enfranchisement of their entire population; and that the other states were expected soon to imitate these examples. Is it credible, then, that at this very time, the states were unwilling to trust the execution of this stipulation, unanimously adopted, to each other? The whole stress of the argument derived from the history of the times, when thoroughly examined, is found to rest on the degrading imputation of bad faith by the slave-holding to the non-slaveholding states. I reject, with scorn, an inference founded on such an imputation, and am amazed that citizens of the free states can be found willing to endorse the libel. I adopt rather the language of Chancellor Walworth, the case of Jack vs. Martin, and say, "Can it be for a moment supposed that the framers of the Constitution intended to authorize the reclamation of fugitive slaves, to a distant part of the Union, as a slave, upon a mere summary examination before an inferior state magistrate, who is clothed with no power to compel the attendance of witnesses to ascertain the truth of the allegations of the respective parties? Whatever others may think upon this subject, I must be permitted to doubt whether the patriots of the Revolution, who framed the Constitution of the United States, and who had incorporated into the Declaration of Independence, as one of the justifiable causes of separation from our mother country, that the inhabitants of the colonies had been transported beyond seas for trial, could ever have intended to sanction such a principle, as to one who was merely claimed as a fugitive from service in another state."

So much for the argument in favor of the constitutionality of the act of Congress derived from a review of the history of the times. It is clear that the presumption arising from that history, is against the inference that the convention designed to confer on Congress legislative power in regard to this subject. But inferences from attendant circumstances are ever to be received with great caution in the construction of a written instrument, and can have no weight when in conflict with the plain import of its terms. We must look then, after all, to the Constitution itself, and ascertain its provisions. What are they? These only—"No person, held to service or labor, in one state under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due;"—"And Congress shall have power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by this constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." If Congress have power to legislate in reference to fugitives from service, the grant is contained in these provisions. Congress has the power to legislate, if at all, because the first cited provision confers some power in regard to escaping servants, and because the last cited provision confers the right to make laws necessary to the execution of that power. Now what power does this first cited clause confer? Can any lawyer honestly say that, in his opinion, it confers any? The language is the language of a compact—a stipulation—a treaty. It is not such language as the framers of the constitution employed in conferring power: it is not such language as any well informed man would employ who designed to confer a power. It has, however, a plain, obvious, natural meaning. It restrains the operations of state laws, and imposes duties on the states to be performed. It has the same meaning (and no other) in the constitution of the United States, as it would have if it stood as a clause in a treaty between France and England. It must be remembered that the clause in question was transferred from the ordinance of 1787 into the constitution. In the ordinance it was, beyond all question, a clause of compact: how can it then be any thing else than a clause of compact in the constitution. It must be remembered also, that where duties are imposed upon the states by other clauses in the constitution, and it is designed that Congress shall have power to enforce or regulate the performance of those duties, the necessary power is conferred by express words. Thus, in the section immediately preceding that relating to fugitives from service, it is stipulated that, "Full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public records, acts, and judicial proceedings of every other state." But this stipulation confers no power on Congress. The framers of the constitution were sensible of this, and therefore added this clause, "And the Congress may, by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved and the effect thereof." If the plain language of the constitution had left it in doubt whether the clause in relation to escaping servants conferred power on Congress or not, it would seem as if the provision in regard to public records, and judicial proceedings, must satisfy the most strenuous advocate for constructive powers.

And the construction which has now been given to this clause in the constitution, is sustained by some of the ablest judges in the country. Chief Justice Shaw, of Massachusetts, in the case of the slave-child Med, said expressly that the clause in question was a clause of compact, in the nature of a treaty stipulation. And Chancellor Walworth, of New York, in the case already cited, says that this clause "imposes a restriction and a duty upon states and individuals, but vests no power in the federal government or any department or officer thereof, except the judicial power of declaring and enforcing the rights secured by the constitution; and the act of Congress of 1793 is certainly not a law to carry into effect the judicial power of the United States, which judicial power cannot be vested in state magistrates." It is plain then upon a fair construction of the constitution and upon authority, that the clause relating to fugitives from service, vests no power in Congress, or in the government, or in any department or officer thereof; and if this point be established, the argument is at an end. For if the clause vests no power in Congress, or in the government, or in any of its departments or officers, then the provision which authorizes Congress to pass laws necessary and proper to carry such powers into execution, confers no authority to legislate on this subject.

The constitutionality of this act of Congress might be demonstrated by other arguments, but it seems a waste of time and labor to add any thing to the considerations already urged. We pass over, therefore, all the arguments derived from the palpable repugnancy of the act to every provision in the constitution designed to secure personal liberty, and particularly to that clause which declares that "the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended; and to those amendments which declare that the right of the people to be secure in their persons against unreasonable seizure, shall not be violated;" and "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." And, in concluding my remarks on this topic, I again adopt the language of Chancellor Walworth, and say, "I have looked in vain among the powers delegated to Congress by the constitution, for any general authority to that body to legislate on this subject. Upon the fullest examination of the subject, I find it impossible to bring my mind to the conclusion, that the framers of the constitution have authorized Congress to pass a law by which the certificate of a justice of the peace shall be made conclusive evidence of the right of the claimant, to remove one, who may be a free native-born citizen of the state, to a distant part of the Union, as a slave, and thereby deprive such person of the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus, as well as his common law suit to try his right of citizenship in the state where the claim is made, and where he is residing at the time of such claim."

But the majority of the Committee not only insist that the act of Congress is warranted by the constitution, but that it is perfectly consistent with the ordinance of 1787.—What says the ordinance? "The inhabitants of said territory shall always be entitled to the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus, and to trial by jury." Is an act under which an inhabitant of the territory may be claimed as an escaping servant, seized, carried before a magistrate, and certified into slavery, without a jury, consistent with this provision in the ordinance? But, say the majority of the committee, a fugitive from service cannot be an inhabitant. Can he not? Suppose a white apprentice or hired servant to escape into Ohio from a sister state, and reside here for years, is he not an inhabitant? Suppose an individual, held under the laws of a sister state to service as a slave, to escape into Ohio, and reside here for years, without any claim by the party to whom such service is due, does he not become an inhabitant? If the majority of the committee will consult Johnson or Webster, they will find, that a person so residing in the state, whatever may have been his previous condition, does become an inhabitant of the state. But this is not important. Be such persons inhabitants or not, it matters little to the present question, since, under the act, any man in the state may be seized and put on trial for his personal freedom, without a jury; and if such an act does not violate the sacred right of trial by jury, it is difficult to conceive how that right can be violated. The provision in the ordinance was transferred into the constitution of the state, and when Ohio came into the Union, she came in claiming the full benefit of the rights secured to the people by its perpetual compact. It is not, therefore, that the constitution of the United States affected the provisions embodied in the memorable compact of 1787; for this compact was unalterable, unless by common consent, and there has been no common consent that the right of trial by jury should be in the least mutilated, abridged, or restricted. The right, therefore, remains as it was under the ordinance, and the constitution of the United States cannot authorize Congress to impair or invade it. I do not think it worth while, however, to elaborate or fortify this position, because we have already seen that the constitution of the United States does not authorize Congress to legislate at all in regard to escaping servants, and of course does not warrant any violation of this provision in the ordinance by act of Congress.

The majority of the committee do not deny that the ordinance is of paramount authority. Indeed, they seem to think, that the benefits of the writ of habeas corpus, secured by that instrument, cannot be taken away by the act of Congress. Their language is, "the writ of habeas corpus may, and does issue upon the application of a slave who resists the right to reclaim him. The right to this writ is not, however, depend upon the ordinance. It is a writ of right at common law. The judge, upon application, is bound to grant it to bond or free; and this privileged writ, in the language of the constitution, 'shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety shall require it.'" There are two remarkable errors in this short paragraph.

In the first place, the right to this writ does depend upon the ordinance, for, so long as the compact contained in that instrument remains unaltered, the people of Ohio will be entitled under it to the benefit of that writ; whereas, did not the ordinance exist, the right to the writ would depend on the federal or state constitution. In the second place, "this privileged writ" is virtually suspended by the act of Congress. Although the majority of the committee seem to think, and very justly too, that it is a writ to the benefit of which all are entitled, nothing is more certain than that the act of Congress positively annihilates it in all cases arising under it. We have already seen what Chancellor Walworth says on this point; and it is well known to professional gentlemen, in Hamilton county at least, that in the case of the colored woman, Matilda, and in other cases, the Court of Common Pleas has refused to take jurisdiction, upon habeas corpus, when the applicant for the writ has been taken before a magistrate as an escaping servant.—And, if the act of Congress be constitutional, such is the necessary result; for the legislation of Congress excludes the legislation of the states, and the jurisdiction which it confers is exclusive jurisdiction. No state court, not even the highest, can interfere by habeas corpus or otherwise, to arrest the proceeding before a magistrate, if that proceeding be authorized by an act of Congress, which is itself warranted by the constitution. It is not true, as the majority of the committee suppose, that the right to the writ of habeas corpus and the act of Congress can stand together; but it is true that the act that the act takes away the benefit of the writ, furnishes a conclusive argument against its constitutionality.

It is but justice to the majority of the committee to say, that they seem by no means satisfied with the success of their attempt to demonstrate the constitutionality of the act of 1793, for, after having argued the matter at great length, they arrive at the safe conclusion, that "it would be unprofitable to discuss these constitutional questions at large in a legislative report;"—that another tribunal than a legislative committee is established for the discussion and decision of these questions;—that an act of Congress, whether constitutional or not, is the supreme law of the land, until declared unconstitutional by that tribunal;—and that to legislate in regard to a subject upon which Congress has already legislated, though constitutionally, is rank nullification. It must be confessed, that the majority of the committee have displayed considerable judgment in the selection of horrid monsters, to guard the front and rear of their report. Abolitionists scowl in the van, and Nullification lowers in the rear. But—

"The best-laid schemes of mice and men
Gang after gang,"
And the majority of the committee are not so fortunate in the effect of their device as their ingenuity deserved. It

will not do to say, that all legislation which contravenes or interferes with congressional legislation is nullification. In regard to this very subject of escaping servants, New York has legislated and provided a trial by jury for all who may be claimed as fugitives from justice, in New York guilty of nullification! Massachusetts has also legislated on this subject, and provided a trial by jury in these cases. Is the old Bay state a partner in the sin of South Carolina? To come nearer home—Ohio has legislated in regard to fugitives from justice and has legislated, too, in direct contravention of the provisions of the act of Congress on the same subject. Will the majority of the committee say that Ohio "has acted in accordance with a doctrine so justly repudiated?" Really this evasion does no credit to the majority of the committee. The chairman of the committee is said to be an able lawyer. Surely, then, he knows that an unconstitutional act of Congress is merely void, and binds no one, and is no more obligatory before than after it is adjudged to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Of course the existence of such an act in the statute-book, constitutes no obstacle to legislation on the same subject by a state legislature; much less does it excuse a state legislature for neglecting its first and highest duty to the people—that of securing to every member of the community the complete enjoyment of his natural and social rights, by throwing around those rights all the safeguards which the wise jealousy of our forefathers has provided. And we confidently trust, and we think the signs of the times warrant the hope, that the day is at hand when no man in Ohio will be left unprotected against "unreasonable seizure," or liable to the "deprivation of liberty without due process of law," or destitute of "the benefit of the writ of habeas corpus, and of the trial by jury."

MARCELLUS.

P. S. Great weight is undoubtedly due to the opinions of the able lawyer and justly respected citizen who edit the Cincinnati Gazette. I am induced, therefore, to notice briefly his late remarks touching the report just reviewed. Mr. Hammond says, that in many cases of personal right and private property, the right of trial by jury has never existed. This is true, but in regard to questions of personal liberty the right of trial by jury is very ancient. The writ de homine replegiendo is almost as old as Magna charta itself. Of course the decision of Judge Grinnick does not touch the class of cases in which questions of personal liberty are involved. Mr. Hammond says, further, that the provision in the Constitution, relating to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." Where is the evidence which sanctions this assertion? What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts in our history warrant the assumption that a person claimed as an escaping servant and delivered up to fugitives from service, "proceeds upon the old fashioned, just and honorable assumption that the whole case would be fully and fairly tried in the state to which the party is removed." What facts

POETRY.

From Blackwood's Magazine, for October.

The Ages.

A thousand years—a thousand years!
So long a time has worn away,
And o'er the hardening earth appears
Green pastures mix'd with rocks of grey;
And there huge monsters roll and feed,
Each frame a mass of sullen life,
Through slimy wastes and woods of reed
They crawl, and tramp, and blend in strife.

A thousand years—a thousand years!
And o'er the wide and grassy plain,
A human form the prospect charms,
The new-sprung lord of earth's domain.
Half clad in skins he builds a cell,
Where wife and child create a home;
He looks to Heaven with thoughts that swell,
And owns a Might beyond the dome.

A thousand years—a thousand years!
And lo! a city and a realm:
Its weighty pile a temple rears,
And walls are bright with sword and helm;
Each man is lost amid a crowd;
And laws, and rites, and songs are loud;
And myriads hail their monarch's fame.

A thousand years—a thousand years!
And now, besides the rolling sea,
Where many a sailor nimbly steers,
The eager tribes are bold and free.
The graceful shrine adorns the hill;
The square of council spreads below;
Their theatres, a people fill,
And list to thought's divinest flow.

A thousand years—a thousand years!
We live amid a sterner land,
Where laws ordain'd by ancient seers,
Have trained the spirit of command;
There pride, and policy, and war,
With haughty fronts are gazing slow,
And bound at their triumphal car,
O'er master'd kings to darkness go.

A thousand years—a thousand years!
And chivalry and faith are strong;
And through devotion's sorrowing tears,
Is seen high help for earthly wrong.
Fair gleams the cross with sunny light,
Beneath a dim cathedral arch;
'Tis raised the burgher Staff of Right,
And heads the stately feudal march.

A thousand years!—How swift the chain
That drags along our slight to-day!
Before that sound returns again
The present will have stream'd away,
And all our world of busy strength
Will dwell in calmer halls of time,
And then with joy will own at length,
Its course is fix'd, its end sublime.

From the Connecticut Observer.

The following sweet lines were written after a walk in the
burial ground, in the North part of this city and presented
to the bereaved parents, as an expression of the au-
thor's sympathy in their repeated afflictions.

The Three Little Graves.

I sought at twilight's pensive hour
To gaze on those which mourners rear,
Where many a marble tomb reveals
The City of the dead—
The City of the dead—where all
From feverish toil repose,
While round their beds, the simple flower
In sweet profusion blows.

And there I mark'd a pleasant spot
Enclosed with tender care,
Where side by side, three infants lay,
The only tenants there—
Nor weed nor bramble rail'd its head
To mar the hallow'd scene,
And 'twas a mother's tears, methought,
Which kept that turf so green.

The eldest was a gentle girl,
She sunk as rose-buds fall,
And then two little brothers came,
They were their parent's all—
Their parent's all—and ah, how oft
The moan of sickness rose,
Before, within those narrow moulds,
They found a long repose.

Their cradle-ports, beside the hearth,
At winter's eve, are o'er,
Their tuneful tones, so full of mirth,
Delight the ear no more—
Yet still the thrilling echo lives,
And many a lisping word
Is treasur'd in affection's heart,
By grieving memory stor'd.

L. H. S.

From the Methodist Protestant.

To a Skeleton.

Thou monument of death! Thou wreck of life!
Sad, sole remembrance of mortal strife!
Thou image of destruction!—type of doom!
Mocker of joy!—and index to the tomb!
Thou smilest gladly on our living forms,
And seem'st to whisper—Ye shall feed the worms!

Thine eyes, how dim! Thine ears how dull!
How lost to thought, thine empty eye-balls!
Thy ribs, how heartless, cold, and red of love—
And motionless thy limbs, so wont to move!

Thou wast as I;—sensation clothed thy bones;
With bliss thy bosom glow'd, and heaved with groans
A thousand wants, a thousand whims impell'd,
Thy buoyant feet to trace the verdant field—
Or sped thy longing eyes to see the play—
Or kept the pathway to the house of prayer—
Thy hands to bless the poor with daily bread—
Or tear the suffering debtor from his bed—
Or, haply, to some pledged but faithless friend,
Thyself the trembling, begging hand extend.

Ha! strong the fancy that could see thee now—
Hard by the helm, or plodding at the plough!
Once, all instinct with art, thy will control'd
Its countless instruments with subtle hold,
Unseen—but still omnipotent to move,
To deeds of bitter hate or sweetest love.

Yet where is now that will? Canst thou declare?
Unclose thy haggard jaws and tell me where!
All unobscured, uncheck'd, triumphant still,
Immortal flames the free and glorious will;
O'er time, o'er distance, spreads its wide domain;
The noblest subject of Jehovah's reign—

PELLANDER.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Scenes in the French Revolution.

The following extract is from a work entitled "The French Revolution, a History, in 3 volumes, by Thomas Carlyle. The London and Westminster Review remarks concerning it:—
"This is not so much a history, as an epic poem; and notwithstanding, or even in consequence of this, the trust of historians. The extract we quote, gives a fearful picture of the natural results of oppression, long continued. It is a passage on the Burning of Chateaux.

"Starvation has been known among the French commonly before this; known and familiar.—Did we not see them, in the year 1775, presenting, in sallow faces, in wretchedness and raggedness, their Petition of Grievances; and, for answer, getting a brand-new gallows forty feet high? Hunger and darkness, through long years? For look back on that earlier Paris riot, when a great personage, worn out by debauchery, was believed to be in want of blood paths; and mothers, in worn raiment, yet with living hearts under it, filled the public places, with their wild Rachel-cries,—stilled also by the galleys, Twenty years ago, the Friend of men [preaching to the dead] described the Limousin peasants as wearing a pain-stricken (soufflé) look, a look past complaint, 'as if the oppression of the great were like the hail and the thunder, a thing irremediable, the ordinance of nature.'—And now, if in some great hour, the shock of a falling Bastille should awaken you; and it were found to be the ordinance of art merely; and remediable, reversible?

"Or has the reader forgotten that 'flood of savages,' which, in sight of the same Friend of Man, descended from the mountains at Mont d'Or—Lank haired haggard faces; shapes rawboned, in high sabots; in woolen jupes, with leather girdles studded with copper nails? They rocked from foot to foot, and beat time with their elbows too, as the quarrel and battle which were not long in beginning went on; shouting fiercely; the lank faces distorted into the similitude of a cruel laugh. For they were darkened and hardened: long had they been the prey of excise-men and tax-men of clerks with the cold spurt of their pen.' It was the fixed prophecy of our old Marquis, which no man would listen to, that 'such Government by Blind-man's-buff, stumbling along too far, would end by the General Overturn, the Culotte Generale!'

"No man would listen, each went his thoughtless way;—and Time and Destiny also travelled on. The Government by Blind-man's-buff, stumbling along, has reached the precipice inevitable for it. Dull Drudgery, driven on, by clerks with the cold dard spurt of their pen, has been driven into a Communion of Drudges! For now, moreover, there have come the strangest confused tidings; by Paris Journals with their paper wings; or still more portentous where no Journals are, by rumor and conjecture; Oppression not inevitable;—Bastille prostrate, and the Constitution fast getting ready! Which Constitution, if it be something and not nothing, what can it be but bread to eat?

"The traveller, 'walking up hill bridle in hand,' overtakes 'a poor woman,' the image, as such commonly are, of drudgery and scarcity looking sixty years of age, though she is not yet twenty-eight. They have seven children, her poor drudge and she: a farm, with one cow, which helps to make the children soup also; also one little horse, or garron. They have rents and quit-rents, hence to pay to this Seigneur, Oat sacks to that, King's taxes, State-labor, Church-taxes, taxes enough;—and think the times inexpressible. She has heard that somewhere, in some manner, something is to be done for the poor: 'God send it soon; for the dues and taxes crush us down (nous écrasent)!'

"Fair prophecies are spoken, but they are not fulfilled. There have been Notables, Assemblies, turnings out and comings in. Intriguing and manoeuvring; parliamentary eloquence and arguing, Greek meeting Greek in high places, has long gone on; yet still bread comes not. The harvest is reaped and garnered; yet still we have no bread.—Urged by despair and by hope, what can Drudgery do, but rise, as predicted, and produce the General Overturn?

"Fancy, then, some five full-grown millions of such gaunt gures, with their haggard faces (figures haggard) in woolen jupes, with copper-studded leather girdles, and high sabots,—starting up to ask, as in forest-roarings, their washed Upper Classes, after long unreviewed centuries, virtually this question: How have we treated us; how have you taught us, fed us, and led us, while we toiled for you? The answer can be read in flames, over the mighty summer-sun. This is the feeding and leading we have had of you: EMPTINESS,—of pocket, of stomach, of head, and of heart. Behold there is nothing in us; nothing but what nature gives here wild children of the desert; Ferocity and Appetite; Strength grounded on Hunger. Did we mark among your Rights of Man, that man was not to die of starvation, while there was bread reaped by him? It is among the Rights of Man.

"Seventy-two Chateaux have flamed aloft in the Maconnais and Beaujolais alone; this seems the centre of the conflagration; but it has spread over Dauphine, Alsace, the Lyonnais; the whole south-east is in a blaze. All over the north, from Rouen to Metz, disorder is abroad; smugglers of salt go openly in armed bands; the barriers of towns are burnt; gallies, official persons put to flight.—'It was thought,' says Young, 'the people, from hunger, would revolt; and we see they have done it. Desperate Laekalls, long prowling aimless, now finding hope in desperation itself, every where form a nucleus. They ring the Church bell by way of focus: and the Parish turns out to work.' Ferocity, atrocity; hunger and revenge: such work as we can imagine!

"It stands in now with the Seigneur, who, for example, 'has wall'd up the only Fountain of the Township,' who has ridden high on his chariot and parchment; who has preserved Game not wisely but too well.—Churches also, and Canons, are sacked, without mercy; which have shorn the flock too close, forgetting to feed it. We to the land over which Sansculottism, in its day of vengeance, tramps roughshod,—shod in sabots!—Highbred Seigneurs, with their delicate women and little ones, had to fly half-naked, under cloud of night; glad to escape the flames, and even worse. You meet them at the tables d'hôte of inns; making wise reflections or foolish that rank is destroyed; uncertain whether they shall now wed;—The metayer will find it convenient to be slack in paying rent. As for the Tax-gatherer, he, long hunted as a bird of prey, may now get hunted as one; his Majesty's Exchequer will not fill up the Deficient, this season: it is the notion of many that a Patriot Majesty, being the Restorer of French Liberty, has abolished most taxes, though, for their private ends, some men make a secret of it.

"Where this will end? In the Abyss, one may prophesy; whether all Delusions are, at all moments, travelling; where this Delusion has now arrived. For if there be a Faith, from of old, it is this, as we often repeat, that no Lie can live for ever. The very Truth has to change its vesture, from time to time, and be born again. But all Lies have sentence of death written down against them, in Heaven's Chancery itself; and, slowly or fast, advance necessarily towards their hour. 'The sign of a Grand Seigneur being landlord,' says the

*Pds Adoptif Memoires de Mirabeau, l. 243-394.

†See Arthur Young, l. 137—150, &c.

‡Arthur Young, l. 134.

§See Histoire Parlementaire, ii. 243—8.

¶See Young, l. 149, &c.

vehement plain-spoken Arthur Young, 'are wastes, landes, deserts, ling; go to his residence, you will find it in the middle of a forest, peopled with deer, wild boars and wolves. The fields are scenes of pitiable management, as the houses are of misery. To see so many millions of hands, that would be industrious, all idle and starving; oh, if I were legislator of France, for one day, I would make these great lords skip again!'" O Arthur, thou now actually beholdest them skip;—wilt thou grow to grumble at that too?

"For long years and generations it lasted, but the time came. Feather-brain, whom no reasoning and no pleading could touch, the glare of the firebrand had to illuminate: there remained but that method. Consider it, look at it! The widow is gathering nettles for her children's dinner; a perfunctory Seigneur, delicately lounging in the (Eil-de-Bœuf, has an alchemy whereby he will extract from her the third nettle, and name it Rent and Law: such an arrangement must end. Ought it? But, O most fearful is such an ending! Let those, to whom God, in His great mercy, has granted time and space, prepare another and milder one."

*Arthur Young, i. 12—47—84, &c.

Western Academician for February.

Report on the mutual relation of trustees and faculties in literary institutions.—By B. P. Aydelott.

Report whether infant schools ought to be constructed rather with reference to moral than intellectual culture.—By Joshua Wilson.

On the necessity of education keeping pace with the progress of the mechanic arts.—By Benjamin Huntton.

The inducements to accept teaching as a life-profession.—By Miss Julia E. Dumont.

Report on the course of instruction in the common schools of Prussia and Württemberg.—By C. E. Stowe.

Meteorological observations.—By Joseph Ray.

Turkey.

A society has just been formed at Constantinople, with the title of "Society of Useful Knowledge." It intends to publish a monthly journal, called "The Journal of Useful Knowledge." The editor, who accompanied the youths sent to Paris to receive a French education, intends to found this publication on the same plan as the French work with the like title.

The Sultan has also sent for a French scholar to direct a class for teaching the French language at Constantinople, at the expense of the government.

United States of America.

The number of new works which appeared in the United States in 1834 and 1835 amounted to 1013, forming 1300 volumes, and the cost of which may be estimated at 1,220,000 dollars. In 1836 the number was considerably increased, and the cost of the books published in that year cannot be computed at less than 1,500,000 dollars. Boston, New-York, Philadelphia, and Hartford, furnished nineteen twentieths of the total amount.

In most cases the editions of one and the same work are larger and more frequent in the United States than in any other country. Many re-printed English works have there passed through three or four editions, while the publishers of the original have but one. In one instance the sale of a book in America amounted to 100,000 copies, whereas in England only four editions of 1000 copies each were disposed of.

The amount of literary productions in America has more than doubled during the last ten years.—The sale of five book-selling establishments amounted in 1836 to 1,350,000 dollars. The publisher paid in the five years preceding 1834, 135,000 dollars for copyrights, out of which 30,000 dollars were for two works only; Carey, Lea, and Blanchard, paid last year 30,000 dollars to American writers, and Harper and brothers have paid about the same sum for several years past.

The following statement will show the relative proportion of native and imported literary productions in 1834:

Original American works	Reprints of foreign works
Education	73
Divinity	37
Novels and tales	19
History and biography	19
Jurisprudence	20
Poetry	8
Travels	8
Fine arts	8
Miscellaneous works	50

Thus it appears that in American literature the scientific and practically useful predominates, and that works of imagination are chiefly derived from foreign sources. The school-books are almost all written or compiled in the United States, and some idea of the extensive business done in them may be formed from the circumstance, that of some of the most popular compilations in geography from 100,000 to 300,000 copies have been sold in ten years; so that in many instances works of this kind produce a permanent income as well to the author as to the publisher. During the last five years the number of American original works in proportion to reprints has nearly doubled.

Speech of a Sailor at a Temperance Meeting.—
"Please your honor," said the old boatswain.—
"I've come down here by the captain's orders; and if there is anything stowed away in my weather-beaten sea-chest of a head, that may be of any use to a brother sailor, or a landsman either, they are heartily welcome. If it will do any good in such a case as this, that you've all come here to talk about, you may all go down below, and overhaul the lockers of an old man's heart. It may seem a little strange, that an old sailor should put his helm hard-astern, to get out of the way of a glass of grog; but if it wasn't for the same old, as I am, I'd be tied up to the rigging, and take a dozen, rather than suffer a drop to go down my hatch.

"Please your honor, it's no very pleasant matter for a poor sailor to go over the shore, where he lost a fine ship; but he must be a shabby fellow, that wouldn't stick up a beacon, if he could, and fetch home soundings and bearings, for the good of all others who may sail in the same seas. I've followed the sea for fifty years. I had good and kind parents. They brought me up to read the Bible and keep the Sabbath. My father drank spirit sprightly. My mother never drank any. When ever I asked for a taste, he was always wise enough to put me off; 'Milk for babes, my lad,' he used to say; 'children must take care how they meddle with edge tools.' When I was twelve I went to sea, cabin boy of the Tippoo Saib; and the captain promised my father to let me have no grog; and he kept his word. After my father's death I began to drink spirit—and I continued to drink it till I was forty-two. I never remember to have been tipsy in my life; but I was greatly afflicted with headach and rheumatism for several years. I got married when I was twenty-one. We had two sons; one of them is living. My eldest boy went to sea with me three voyages, and a finer lad—just then something seemed to stick in the old boatswain's throat, but he was speedily relieved, and proceeded in his remarks.—'I used to think father was over-strict about spirit, and when it was cold or wet, I didn't see any harm in giving Jack a little, though he was only fourteen. When he got ashore, where he could serve out his own allowance, I soon saw that he doubled the quantity.

I gave him a talk. He promised to do better; but he didn't. I gave him another, but he grew worse; and finally, in spite of all his poor mother's prayers, and my own, he became a drunkard. It sunk my poor wife's spirits entirely, and brought mine to the water's edge. Jack became very bad, and I lost all control over him. One day I saw a gang of men and boys poking fun at a poor fellow who was reeling about in the middle of the circle, and swearing terribly. Nobody likes to see his profession dishonored, so I thought I'd run down and take him in tow. Your honor knows what a sailor's heart is made of; what do you think I felt when I found it was my own son—I couldn't resist the sense of duty; and I spoke to him pretty sharply. But his answer threw me all aback, like a white squall in the Levant. He heard me through, and doubling his fist in my face, he exclaimed, 'You made me a drunkard!' It cut me like a lance; and I felt as if I should have gone down by the board. As he uttered these words, the tears ran down the channels of the old man's cheeks like rain. Friend Simpson was deeply affected, and parson Sterling sat with his handkerchief before his eyes. Indeed, there was scarcely a dry eye in the assembly. After wiping his eyes on the sleeve of his pea jacket, the old sailor proceeded—

"I tried, night and day, to think of the best plan to keep my other son from following on to destruction, in the wake of his elder brother. I gave him daily lessons of temperance; I held up before him the example of his poor brother; I cautioned him not to take spirit on an empty stomach, and I kept my eye constantly upon him. Still I took my daily allowance; and the sight of the dram bottle, the smell of liquor, and the example of his own father, were able lawyers on't other side; I saw the breakers ahead; and I prayed God not only to preserve my child, but myself; for I was sometimes alarmed for my own safety. About this time I went to meeting one Sunday, and the minister read the account of the overthrow of Goliath. As I returned home I compared temperance, in my own mind, to the giant of Gath; and I asked myself, why might there not be found some remedy for the evil as simple as the means employed for his destruction. For the first time the thought of total abstinence occurred to my mind; from the brook and the shepherd's sling? I told my wife what I had been thinking of. She said she had no doubt that God had put the thought into my mind. I called in Tom, my youngest son, and I told him I had resolved not to taste another drop, blow high or blow low. I called for all there was in the house, and threw it out of the window. Tom promised to take no more. I never had reason to doubt that he kept his promise. He is now first mate of an Indianan. Now, your honor, I have said all I had to say about my own experience. May be I've spun out too long a yarn already. But I think it wouldn't puzzle a Chinese juggler to take to pieces all that has been said on t'other side."

BEAR STORY.—A friend has permitted us to make the following extract from a letter received from his correspondent at Machias, Maine, dated 2d inst.

"On Tuesday last three boys went a few miles to catch a deer. They followed the track a mile or two, when they came unexpectedly across a bear's den. They had but one gun, and the boy who carried it, fired it into the den, when out came two cubs, about a year or a year and a half old. The cub being discharged, and the boys not having time to load it, threw it away, but as each had a knife, and the cubs ran in opposite directions, one of the boys followed one, and two followed the other. They soon came up, and clinched in with them, and despatched them both with their knives. They returned to the den where they found the old bear, an enormous one, weighing about 400 lbs. The gun shot had wounded her in the neck, but she was ready for battle. They fought her with clubs until they were tired; when at last, one of them getting a little wolfish, drew his knife, and declared he would clinch her if he died in the attempt. They did clinch, and for the first half hour they went end for end. At last old bruin seized him by the leg with her mouth, which gave him an opportunity to use his knife, which he did in such manner as to compel her to yield, and give up the ghost. The boys then turned to, dressed the bears and cubs handsomely and went home. The next day they went with a sled, and hauled the whole to my store, where they were exhibited to a large number of people. The old one would stand as high as a man—say six feet. On the whole it was rather a courageous fight for three boys. Their names were Marshall Harmon, Rufus Berry, and Otis Hanscom."

*We presume the writer means standing on the hind legs. [Best Trans.]

Uncommon Weakness.

"Doctor, I'm quite sick."
"What is the matter?"
"Weakness."
"Have you a good appetite?"
"Excellent."
"Does what you eat agree with you?"
"Uncommon well."
"Do you rest well at night?"
"Why I sleep fourteen hours out of the twenty-four without being sensible whether I am dead or alive."
"Well, that's pretty well. Good appetite, sleep well, and food don't hurt you?"
"Yes, doctor, but I've an uncommon weakness."
"Where?"
"Why, a kind of universal weakness."
"How much do you weigh?"
"Only one hundred and ninety-six and a fraction."
"Do you perform any business?"
"No, doctor, I have nothing to do—my steward collects my rents."
"Well Mr. one hundred and ninety-six—the only thing that will cure your universal weakness is sawing wood, or walking three miles and back every day."

"Doctor, I differ—my weakness is seated."
"That's from sitting."
"No doctor, I lie on the couch more than half the time."
"And so you have the lying weakness also?"
"Yes, doctor, I have my fears that way, for when I sit up two hours at a time, I'm uncommon weak afterwards."
"Well, you have overdone yourself. You must go to bed and repose your weakness, or I have my doubts whether you will ever get it out of your nature. You are naturally a weak man. I rather think it must have been a hereditary complaint in your family. Wasn't your mother a weak woman?"
"Can't say, doctor; that she was; but my father was an uncommon weak man."—*Courier.*

WISCONSIN TERRITORY. Among the acts passed at the second session, just closed, of the Legislature, are the following to establish and incorporate. The Wisconsin University at Green Bay; the Bank of Racine; the Bank of Iowa; the State Bank of Wisconsin at Prairie du Chien; the Milwaukee and Racine Mutual Insurance Company; the Rock River Rail Road Company; the Racine and Rock River Rail Road Company; the Philandrian College in the town of Denmark; the University of the Territory of Wisconsin; the Davenport Manual Labor College; an act to prevent disasters on steam boats navigating the waters of the Territory; an act to incorporate the city of Burlington. The Legislature closed its labors on the 20th of January, having been in session 75 days.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

To Country Merchants! BOOK AND PAPER STORE.

TRUMAN & SMITH, Publishers, Bookellers and Stationers, No. 150 Main, between Fourth and Fifth streets, Cincinnati. Have a constant supply of Books in every department of Literature and Science, at reduced prices. Country Merchants, and all others wanting BOOKS AND STATIONERY, at wholesale or retail, are invited to call before purchasing elsewhere.

School Books, in any variety and quantity, at Eastern prices. Bibles of different kinds, from large quarto to 32 mo., plain, and elegant. All the Biblical commentaries, for common use, also a common variety of Hymn Books. Miscellaneous Works, consisting of Travels, Histories, Biographies, Memoirs.

New Publications, on every subject of interest, regularly received, immediately after publication. Blank Books, Slates, Slate Pencils, Copy Books, Letter, Writing and Printing Paper, and Writing Ink, Wafers, Sealing Wax, and every article of STATIONERY.

STEAM SCOURING AND CLOTHES-DRESSING EMPORIUM.

The subscriber continues to carry on the Steam Scouring business, at his old stand on Walnut street, between 3d and 4th, and respectfully returns his thanks to the citizens of Cincinnati and vicinity, for their former patronage, and hopes by strict attention to the business to merit a continuance of their favors. His mode of renovating is upon the most approved plan. He assures the public that he will extract all kinds of Grease, Pitch, Tar, Paint, Oil &c., and restore the cloth to its former appearance without injury, by means of a composition that he uses expressly for that purpose.—Cost collars cleaned without altering their shape, and lost colors restored.

Ladies' habits, table-cloths and garments of all descriptions, done at the shortest notice, and in the best possible style.—This he promises to perform or no pay.

CHARLES SATCHEL.

Cincinnati, July 26, 1837. 80—1f.

COOPER'S WARE MANUFACTORY.

400 Barrel and Staff Churns, 200 Nests Tubs, 1000 Wash Boards, 1000 Wooden Bowls.

Also—Measures, Baskets, &c. The Subscribers having now a good and extensive stock of the above articles of their manufacture on hand, offer to sell any quantity on time for good City paper.

Tar, Hops, Brooms, Manila Mats, 100 Kegs Tar, 30 Bales Hops, 50 doz. Brooms, 20 dozen Manila Mats, superior article, with Groceries of every variety, Wholesale and Retail.

Main between 5th & 6th streets, Cincinnati. January 8th, 2—

AGENTS FOR PHILANTHROPIST.

EDWARD WEEK, Financial Agent, O. A. S. S.

M. R. ROBINSON, is hereby duly authorized to act as agent for the Philanthropist and collect Pledges, and Donations for the Ohio A. S. Society.

Wm. Smith and Hiram Elmer are authorized to act as travelling agents for the Philanthropist, and are recommended to the confidence of the public. Lecturers, employed by the O. A. S. S. and its auxiliaries, are also authorized to receive subscriptions for the Philanthropist.

OHIO.

Andrew Black, New Concord, Mus. co.

A. A. Guthrie, Putnam.

Merrick Starr, Mt. Pleasant, Jeff. co.

Sam'l. Lewis, P.M., Harrisville.

Rev. John Walker, New Athens, Harrison co.

James A. Dugdale, Cortsville, Clark co.

Sam'l. G. Meek, P.M., Goshen, Cler. co.

C. B. Huber, Williamsburg.

Davis Fuller, Harford, Trumbull co.

C. G. Hazlip, P.M., Gustrus.

C. G. Sutcliffe, Vernon.

Riveries Bidwell, Kinsman.

Rev. Sydney S. Brown, Newburgh.

"Chester Birge, Vienna.

John Kirk, Youngstown.

John Adair, Poland.

Dr. Ralph Hickox, Warren.

Chas. Clapp, Ravenna, Portage co.

Levia Rice, Cleveland, Cuyahoga co.

Ezekiel Folsom, O. City.

Rev. John Monteith, Ellettsburg, Lorain co.

Thos. S. Graham, Clear Creek, Richland co.

A. S. Grimes, Mountfield.

Alex. Alexander, Antrim, Green co.

John Jolliffe, Esq., Batavia, Clermont co.

B. Reynolds, Felicity.

Henry Wier, Leona, P. O. Brown co.

Simon Pearce, M. D., Decatur.

J. B. Mahan, Sardonia.

Rev. J. C. Lockhart, Russellville.

Hiram Burnett, Winchester, Adams co.

Rev. Syder Burgess, West Union.

Sam'l. C. McConnell, New Petersburg.

Adam Wilson, Greenfield, Highland co.

Joseph A. Morton, Salem Congregation.

L. W. Knowlton, Utica, Licking co.